

Implications for long-term implementation: Findings from the principal and support staff post-pilot data collection

Prepared by:

Van-Kim Lin
Tamara Halle
Kelly Maxwell

Child Trends
7315 Wisconsin Avenue, Suite 1200W
Bethesda, MD 20814



Prepared for:

K-3 Formative Assessment Research Team and Executive Committee



North Carolina's K-3 Formative Assessment Process was developed with funding from the US Departments of Education and Health and Human Services. The K-3 Formative Assessment is being enhanced with funding from the US Department of Education. The contents of these assessment materials do not represent the policy of these Departments and you should not assume endorsement by the Federal Government.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....	iii
Introduction	1
Characteristics of the Survey Respondents	1
Survey Findings	2
Decision-making about the K-3 Formative Assessment pilot	2
Perception of the K-3 Formative Assessment.....	3
Training participation.....	4
Assessment practices.....	5
Communication and Collaboration	7
Communication and collaboration (Table 6)	7
Methods of checking-in with teachers (Table 7)	7
Venues for communication and collaboration (Table 8)	7
Support and Resources	8
Support and resources received and provided.....	8
Supports and resources for principals	9
Attitudes and Opinions	9
Final Recommendations	11
Appendix 1: Data tables	16
Table 1. Respondent characteristics	16
Table 2. Decision-making about the K-3 Formative Assessment pilot.....	17
Table 3. Perception of the K-3 Formative Assessment	18
Table 4. Training.....	18
Table 5. Assessment practices	19
Table 6. Communication and collaboration.....	19
Table 7. Methods to check in with teachers.....	20
Table 8. Venues for teacher communication and collaboration	20
Table 9. Support and resources	21
Table 10. Administrator supports and resources.....	21
Table 11. Attitudes and opinions	22
Appendix 2: K3 Consortium Supervisory Survey.....	23

Executive Summary

This report provides findings from an online survey administered to principals and support staff to learn more about how they have supported teachers and schools to implement the K-3 Formative Assessment during the pilot process¹. K3 Consortium Research Partners developed a survey for school-level principals and support staff in Tier II states² to learn more about how they were or were not involved in the K-3 Formative Assessment pilot process during the 2016 winter/spring pilot. Topics covered in the survey included *decision-making about the K-3 Formative Assessment pilot process, perceptions of the K-3 Formative Assessment, training participation, assessment practices, communication and collaboration, support and resources provided, and attitudes and opinions*. Of the 33 individuals who were contacted by state leads from Arizona, Iowa, and Rhode Island, 14 completed the survey (42% response rate). Frequencies and percentages were calculated for quantitative responses. Open-ended questions were qualitatively analyzed, and themes were identified.

Below is a summary of the key findings:

- **Decision-making about the K-3 Formative Assessment:** Many principals, support staff, and teachers first heard about the K-3 Formative Assessment from someone at the district-level. Initially, there was mixed buy-in from principals and support staff for the K-3 Formative Assessment pilot process. Some were involved in the decision-making process to pilot the K-3 Formative Assessment, and some had reservations about the pilot process before it began.
- **Perceptions of the K-3 Formative Assessment:** After learning more about the K-3 Formative Assessment, principals, support staff, and teachers had a generally positive perception of the K-3 Formative Assessment. Over time, some school-level stakeholders changed their perception. Some had a more positive perception, while others had a less positive perception.
- **Training participation:** Principals and support staff benefited from the training but offered ways to improve the training. Suggestions focused on helping principals and support staff better support teachers administering the assessment. For example, providing more information about how to use the technology that teachers are using can help principals and support staff provide specific support.
- **Assessment practices:** Many schools were regularly using formative assessments. Specifically for the K-3 Formative Assessment, principals and support staff identified benefits (e.g., identify a child's skill level) and challenges (e.g., time) to using the assessment.
- **Communication and collaboration:** School-level stakeholders communicated and collaborated with individuals at all levels (district-, school-, and family-level) using a wide range of methods to discuss the K-3 Formative Assessment. Many of these methods existed prior to the pilot process. District-level meetings and Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) seemed to be the most helpful ways principals and teachers, respectively, discussed the K-3 Formative Assessment process.

¹ A corresponding report about teachers is available, *Implications for long-term implementation: Findings from the teacher post-pilot data collection*.

² Tier II states included in the data collection were Arizona, Iowa, and Rhode Island. Maine opted not to participate in the data collection.

- **Support and resources provided:** Although some schools received support and resources from the state or the district, school-level stakeholders relied on resources at the school level for support. Principals and support staff reported that teachers reached out to them for support, and they were able to provide it.
- **Attitudes and opinions:** While principals and support staff understood the benefits of the K-3 Formative Assessment, they also struggled with the challenges schools and teachers face. They recognized that the assessment has many benefits for the child, but only half of respondents reported it was helpful for guiding instruction. In addition, the amount of time that it takes to complete the assessment was a concern. Additional professional development and resources were the primary ways principals and support staff suggested to address these challenges.

Based on the findings and suggestions offered by principals and support staff, we recommend the following to support long-term implementation:

- **Encourage communication and collaboration between stakeholders at all levels:** Successful statewide implementation relies on engaging stakeholders from the school community at the state, district, and school levels, as well as from the general public. State leads can utilize meetings already established at the district-level to engage school-level administrators. Within the school, pre-existing communication structures can be used to communicate and collaborate about the K-3 Formative Assessment. Additionally, stakeholders at all levels will want to think through what is communicated to families.
- **Clearly and comprehensively explain the K-3 Formative Assessment process to stakeholders at all levels:** Training and communication can be adapted for stakeholders other than teachers, such as superintendents, other state administrators, or families. States will want to utilize methods that have proven to be successful to reach out to various stakeholders to disseminate relevant information. In addition, state leads will want to identify how they can also solicit feedback from these stakeholders.
- **Communicate frequently and with transparency about the K-3 Formative Assessment process:** When communicating about the K-3 Formative Assessment, both benefits and potential challenges should be shared at the beginning of the process. With the complete understanding of the assessment, states can support districts, which in turn can support schools, and schools can support children and families. In addition, state leads will want to communicate frequently and transparently about ways they are trying to address challenges so that stakeholders feel their concerns are being heard.
- **Adapt messaging for specific audiences:** Stakeholders may vary in their understanding of formative assessment, in their openness to new assessments, and in their current assessment practices. Therefore, messaging about the K-3 Formative Assessment should be adapted to each audience. State leads will want to make sure that the messaging meets stakeholders where they are—whether they are open or closed off to a new formative assessment, whether they have or have not had experience using a formative assessment, or whether they recognize or not the benefits of formative assessments in supporting the whole child.

- **Consider a slower or tiered roll-out.** State leads can encourage stronger buy-in and more stable support when they are intentional about how they roll out the K-3 Formative Assessment across the state. Rolling out the assessment over time offers districts and schools the time they need to build the necessary support systems for successful and sustained implementation. Different roll-out options include:
 - starting with schools that are already interested in the assessment;
 - starting with teachers who have requested a formative assessment; and
 - identifying districts that have been successful implementing new assessments in the past, for example.
- **Facilitate a learning community.** While they can look and function differently, learning communities offer an opportunity for stakeholders to interface with others who are using the K-3 Formative Assessment. Principals can share the best ways to support teachers, and teachers can swap ideas for how to collect data or set up their classrooms.
- **Build capacity to provide high-quality training and professional development.** States need to build their capacity to provide high-quality training and professional development to implementers of the new formative assessment system. This involves hiring, training, and monitoring the quality of those providing the training and technical assistance to teachers and school administrators who will, in turn, use the K-3 Formative Assessment. Some improvements school administrators suggested to the training they receive include:
 - giving additional training on the use of technology,
 - providing multiple alternative strategies for collecting data, and
 - offering on-site training.
- **Provide tailored resources and materials:** When different stakeholders play different roles in the implementation process, resources and materials can be tailored to support their specific role. For stakeholders other than teachers, highlighting the benefits of formative assessment, providing ways to support teachers to administer the assessment, and offering strategies for using the information from the assessment in resources can help administrators to support teachers.
- **Find ways to reduce the burden of using the assessment, when possible:** States can consider creative ways to reduce the burden associated with using the assessment. Strategies may be monetary (e.g., paying for release time) or could be nonfinancial (e.g., having other staff support the collection of student evidences).
- **Determine who will drive the implementation process:** Identifying and establishing who is responsible for different parts of the implementation process ensures that implementation progresses successfully, and decisions can be made efficiently. One person can be responsible for training and responding to teachers' questions, whereas another can be in charge of making sure technology is running smoothly across the state. These roles and responsibilities should be clearly documented (e.g., a Terms of Reference or implementation plan).

Introduction

This report provides findings from an online survey administered to principals and support staff to learn about how they have supported teachers and schools to implement the K-3 Formative Assessment during the pilot process. K3 Consortium Research Partners developed a survey for school-level principals and support staff in Tier II states³ to learn about how they were or were not involved in the K-3 Formative Assessment pilot process during the 2016 winter/spring pilot. Topics covered in the survey included *decision-making about the K-3 Formative Assessment pilot process, perceptions of the K-3 Formative Assessment, training participation, assessment practices, communication and collaboration, support and resources provided, and attitudes and opinions* (for the full survey, see Appendix 2).

Between May 17-19, 2016, state leads from Arizona, Iowa, and Rhode Island contacted principals of teachers who were participating in the K-3 Formative Assessment winter pilot and other administrators or support staff who have been involved in the pilot process (e.g., instructional coaches) to participate in an online survey. The survey was open for two and a half weeks (ending on June 6, 2016) and took no longer than 30 minutes to complete. Participants were offered a \$20 Lakeshore Learning gift card for completing the survey. Of the 33 individuals who were contacted, 14 completed the survey (42% response rate).

This report provides an overview of the findings in each of the topic areas listed above. All of the data tables for each survey topic can be found in Appendix 1 of this report, with table numbers provided throughout the document for reference. Frequencies and percentages were calculated. Respondents were allowed to skip questions; therefore, the number of respondents who answered each question is provided as reference in each table. Many questions permitted respondents to provide multiple responses, so percentages may not always equal 100%. Rather, percentages represent the percentage of respondents who choose that response. Open-ended questions were submitted to qualitative data analysis, and themes were identified.

Characteristics of the Survey Respondents

We asked survey respondents to respond to questions related to their state and their role in schools to provide context for the survey findings (Table 1).

- **All three Tier II states were represented.** Seven of the respondents were from Arizona; three from Iowa; and four from Rhode Island.
- **Most respondents were principals, but others participated.** Nine of the respondents were principals of teachers who participated in the pilot. The other five respondents were interventionists, content specialists, an instructional coach, and a superintendent.
- **Respondents varied in their involvement with the pilot process.** We asked respondents about their level of involvement in the pilot process and identified three levels of involvement.

³ Tier II states included in the data collection were Arizona, Iowa, and Rhode Island. Maine opted not to participate in the data collection.

- *Minimal* involvement is defined as having no formal training on the assessment with little to no regular updates from teachers. For example, respondents who were minimally involved had “very little involvement” or acted in a “supervisory capacity only.” Six respondents reported minimal involvement.
- *Moderate* involvement is defined as being formally informed of the assessment with at least some regularity of updates from teachers: “I attended an administrative information session at the beginning of the school year and have met regularly with the teachers that are piloting to get their feedback about the assessment.” Five of the respondents were moderately involved.
- *Extensive* involvement includes being formally trained as well as actively participating in the process: “I attended the training for the assessment and had a caseload of six children that I piloted the K-3 Formative Assessment with in its entirety.” Three respondents were extensively involved in the pilot process.

Summary: Survey respondents represent a variety of perspectives.

Survey Findings

Decision-making about the K-3 Formative Assessment pilot

Principals and support staff answered questions about whether and how they were involved in the decision-making for their school’s participation in the K-3 Formative Assessment pilot process (Table 2). Exploring respondents’ involvement in the decision-making process provides insight into the nature of initial buy-in from principals and support staff.

- **Half of the respondents decided to pilot the K-3 Formative Assessment in their school.** Seven respondents reported being the decision-maker to pilot the assessment in their school. Six respondents did not make the decision to pilot the K-3 Formative Assessment, and one respondent was not sure. Those involved in the decision to participate in the pilot of the K-3 Formative Assessment process in their school reported various reasons for doing so, such as:
 - an interest in using a developmentally appropriate tool,
 - interest in a cutting-edge or not previously used tool, and
 - the ability to have a voice or provide feedback on a tool being offered by the state.
- **Less than half had reservations about their school participating in the pilot.** Eight principals or support staff did not have reservations prior to the pilot process. The five cited various reservations, such as:
 - the amount of time to do the assessment,
 - fit with curriculum or current teaching methods, and
 - lack of technology support.
- **Principals and support staff suggested providing more clarity about the K-3 Formative Assessment process, especially the time commitment.** We asked principals and support staff about what additional information they may have wanted when they first learned about the K-3

Formative Assessment process to inform future training and professional development. Three respondents suggested that being upfront about the time the assessment would take would be helpful. Other suggestions included:

- more information about the alignment of the assessment with state standards or other child assessments,
 - further instructions on how to use the technology, strategies to streamline the data collection process, and
 - the complete details on the domains from the start of the process. Two respondents reported that they did not need any additional information.
- **Respondents primarily reported hearing about the K-3 Formative Assessment pilot from someone at the district-level.** Five respondents reported hearing from a district-level administrator about the pilot process. Five respondents reported hearing about the pilot from a teacher, and six of the respondents reported that teachers heard about the assessment from a district-level administrator.

Summary and Considerations: The results suggest that there may have been mixed buy-in from principals and support staff for the K-3 Formative Assessment pilot process. Only half reported being involved in determining whether the pilot process would happen in their school, and some respondents had reservations about the pilot process. In order to improve buy-in and communication about the K-3 Formative Assessment, states may want to continue to involve district-level administrators. Many of the principals, support staff, and teachers received initial information at the district-level, which seems to be a successful method of communicating about the assessment process. In addition, states may want to make sure that the K-3 Formative Assessment process is clearly and comprehensively explained to all school-level stakeholders, not just teachers who are administering the assessment. Transparency about the process (especially the time commitment) as well as additional information (e.g., alignment with state standards or supports for data collection) may help schools make an educated decision about participating in the assessment process and provide principals and support staff an opportunity to plan how they can best support teachers throughout the assessment process. Lastly, the Field Test may address many concerns about the clarity of the assessment process for school-level administrators and support staff; however, states may want to monitor whether principals and support staff have gained a greater understanding of the assessment process as implementation continues.

Perception of the K-3 Formative Assessment

We asked principals and support staff about their perceptions of the assessment to understand how school-level stakeholders view the assessment before and after using the K-3 Formative Assessment (Table 3). Developing or maintaining a positive view of the assessment over time can help build strong engagement with the K-3 Formative Assessment for the long-term.

- **Initial perceptions of the assessment were generally positive, and teachers felt similarly.** Eight respondents felt positively about the K-3 Formative Assessment, and six respondents were neutral about the assessment. No respondents reported feeling negatively about the assessment. When asked about teachers' perceptions of the assessment, seven respondents

reported that teachers felt positively about the assessment, and six reported that teachers felt neutral about the assessment. Only one respondent reported that teachers felt negatively about the assessment initially.

- **Many principals and teachers changed their perception of the K-3 Formative Assessment after the pilot process began.** Six of the principals and support staff reported having a more positive view of the assessment after the pilot process began; however, five respondents reported having a less positive view. Five of the respondents reported that teachers had a more positive view of the assessment after the pilot process began, but six respondents reported that teachers had a less positive view of the assessment over time.

Summary and Considerations: The initial communication, training, and professional development provided to school-level stakeholders resulted in a positive initial view of the assessment. However, over time, it is possible that school-level stakeholders may have a less positive view of the assessment. States should consider strategies to maintain a positive perception of the assessment over the course of using the assessment, such as addressing challenges, providing continued professional development and training, or gathering feedback for future improvements. For instance, states may want to find ways to gather feedback about the challenges that school-level stakeholders face and suggestions for how to improve these challenges. By asking for feedback, stakeholders gain a sense of ownership in the process, and states have specific information for how they can provide support. Interestingly, if stakeholders start with a positive view, they will likely maintain their positive view.

Training participation

Although principals and support staff were not required to receive training on the K-3 Formative Assessment during the winter/spring pilot, many states encouraged school-level supervisory staff to participate in a variety of different opportunities to learn more about the assessment (i.e., in-person trainings offered to teachers, in-person administrator training when available, and online administrator training modules). We asked about respondents' participation in these training opportunities to learn more about the reach and effectiveness of the current training efforts (Table 4). In addition, we elicited suggestions for improvements to the training to help inform and improve future trainings (Table 4).

- **Half attended in-person trainings.** Seven attended an in-person administrator training. Three attended the training in the summer/fall, and four attended the training in the winter/spring. None of the respondents who reported attending an in-person training reported going to the teacher training.
- **Most principals and support staff did not complete the online training modules.** Two reported completing the online training modules. Of the ten respondents who did not complete the online training module, eight reported that they did not know about the modules, and two reported not having enough time to complete them.
- **Training was helpful for principals, support staff, and teachers, but suggestions for improvement were offered.**
 - When asked about the helpfulness of the training for principals and support staff, responses indicated that the training was generally helpful: "I found the overview very

- helpful;” “It was helpful to learn about the overall assessment, how to collect and input data;” “was very helpful explaining [the K-3 Formative Assessment] and the technology platform;” and “hearing what would be helpful for my teachers.”
- When asked what teachers thought of the training, respondents provided responses, such as “They liked the training and were excited;” “exposure to state thinking was helpful;” and “that each assessment was discussed and explained thoroughly.”
 - Suggestions for improving the training included:
 - Provide additional training on how to use the technology platform
 - Explain and alleviate concerns about the time it would take to do the assessment
 - Provide strategies to document assessment information more easily
 - Offer on-site training

Summary and Considerations: Principals and support staff benefit from the training, but states can address challenges schools face by improving the training provided to school administrators. Moving forward, states will want to continue offering in-person, administrator-specific trainings since principals and support staff often attended an in-person, administrator-focused training rather than a teacher-focused training or completing the online modules. States may also consider on-site trainings that tailor information and strategies for individual schools, but this may only be feasible within small states. Regional trainings may be more workable in larger states. Embedding trainings within existing, regional administrator meetings may be an option.

In the event that administrators are unable to attend in-person training, states may want to find the best way to communicate about and increase awareness of the online modules, which review the same information as what is shared in the in-person training. For example, states may want to designate a point person who is in charge of ensuring that each principal of a school with teachers who are using the assessment has participated in at least one of the training opportunities. In addition, a link to the online module can be included in principal newsletters or shared at principal meetings to increase the likelihood that administrators will learn more about the assessment.

Additionally, states can improve administrator training by incorporating the suggestions provided by survey participants. All of the suggestions seem to help principals and support staff better support teachers administering the assessment. For example, states can provide additional training on the technology that their teachers will be using. Then, principals and support staff can understand the specific struggles and offer relevant support on a system that may be a challenge for some teachers. In addition, trainers can be transparent and upfront about the time that the assessment will take in order to give principals and support staff a realistic picture of the assessment process. Trainers can also offer additional strategies for how teachers can collect assessment information more easily to give principals tangible ways to support teachers who may find the data collection process cumbersome.

Assessment practices

To understand how the K-3 Formative Assessment fits into what schools are already doing, we asked principals and support staff about the current use of formative assessments, challenges teachers face

administering the K-3 Formative Assessment, and whether they use information from the K-3 Formative Assessment (Table 5).

- **Formative assessments are regularly used in schools.** Six reported using formative assessments in the early grades on some regular interval, and two respondents reported using formative assessment for the pilot process. Two of the respondents also mentioned that formative assessments were used to guide and individualize instruction, and one respondent commented that formative assessments were used for planning teaching cycles.
- **Time is the biggest challenge that teachers faced administering the assessment.** Nine respondents reported that teachers' biggest challenge was time. Other issues included problems with technology, acquiring parental permission for children to participate in the pilot, training, and unclear rubrics for the assessment.
- **Respondents identified several ways that teachers can or have been using information from the K-3 Formative Assessment.** Seven respondents reported that teachers can use the information from the K-3 Formative Assessment to guide and individualize instruction. Four respondents identified that the information can be used to assist the child, either to identify the need for intervention or services or to identify a child's skill level. One respondent also reported that the information can be used to help group students. Two respondents were not sure how the information could be used.

Summary and Considerations: Schools are more likely to use and support the K-3 Formative Assessment when they are able to see how it fits into their school's unique context. When individuals understand the benefits of an assessment, they are likely to continue to use it. When they experience difficulties, they are less likely to use the assessment. Results show that principals and support staff recognize both the benefits and the challenges of the K-3 Formative Assessment. When communicating about the K-3 Formative Assessment, states can share the various ways the K-3 Formative Assessment benefits teachers, children, and schools in order to encourage school-level stakeholders to continue to use the assessment. Additionally, states will want to figure out the best ways to address and alleviate any challenges that teachers face when using the assessment as best as states can. For example, states can work with technology vendors to pre-populate students' names into the online platform so that teachers can save time entering each child's name.

In addition, states should consider how the K-3 Formative Assessment can be introduced to schools that are regularly using formative assessments. These schools may consider the K-3 Formative Assessment to be duplicative or unnecessary. Thus, buy-in for a new formative assessment may not be as high. However, if the K-3 Formative Assessment can better meet the needs of schools, the uptake of the K-3 Formative Assessment may be greater since these schools already value a formative assessment process. In schools where formative assessments are not regularly used, states may want to first focus on conveying to staff the importance and appropriate use of formative assessments (e.g., to individualize instruction and not to evaluate teacher performance).

Communication and Collaboration

Effective communication and collaboration between school-level administrators and teachers facilitates successful implementation of the K-3 Formative Assessment. We asked about the modes and frequency of communication and collaboration among principals, support staff, and teachers regarding the K-3 Formative Assessment (Table 6 and 7). We also asked about the venues that teachers utilized to discuss the K-3 Formative Assessment and the helpfulness of these venues for teachers (Table 8).

Communication and collaboration (Table 6)

- **Most principals and support staff communicated or collaborated with others at the district-level.** Thirteen respondents reported that they communicated or collaborated at the district-level either at a meeting, during a presentation, or informally (e.g., email and conversations).
- **Most respondents found it beneficial for teachers across the early grades to communicate or collaborate with each other about the assessment.** Twelve respondents agreed that communication and collaboration across the early primary grades (K-3) are beneficial for teachers; however, two respondents did not think they were beneficial.
- **The K-3 Formative Assessment can be used to communicate to families about a child's skill level and ways families can be involved in student learning.** Four respondents said they would share with families how the assessment looks at the whole child on a continuum of skills, and four respondents reported that they would convey to parents how they can help a child based on the child's current skill level. Three respondents were not sure what they would share with parents/families, and one respondent said that they wouldn't share anything with families.

Methods of checking-in with teachers (Table 7)

- **Principals and support staff checked in with teachers through multiple means with varying frequency.** All of the respondents reported checking in with teachers through one-on-one conversations. Almost all of the respondents reported using meetings and email (79% and 69%, respectively), but only one mentioned using phone calls (8%). Whether the principal or support staff used these modes of communication with teachers once or twice, monthly, weekly, or daily varied depending on the type of communication (Table 7).

Venues for communication and collaboration (Table 8)

- **Principals and support staff reported that teachers use a variety of venues to communicate and collaborate about the K-3 Formative Assessment.** The most popular venue is through informal discussions with other teachers, but teachers also communicate and collaborate through grade-level meetings, teacher-principal meetings, and Professional Learning Communities (PLCs).
- **The communication and collaboration venues were helpful to teachers.** All of the respondents reported that the venues that teachers used to communicate or collaborate were "very" or "somewhat" helpful. The Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) was rated "very" helpful by all principals and support staff.
- **Venues used for communication and collaboration were already in place before the pilot process.** All of the respondents who reported that teachers used grade-level meetings and

teacher-principal meetings for communicating and collaborating about the K-3 Formative Assessment stated that these meetings were in place before the pilot process. Five respondents stated that PLCs were in place before the pilot process, and twelve respondents stated that informal discussions were in place before the pilot process.

Summary and Considerations: School-level stakeholders are using a wide range of communication and collaboration means to discuss the K-3 Formative Assessment. It is important to consider who should be involved in communication and collaboration, the method of communication and collaboration, as well as the means by which communication and collaboration occur as implementation continues. The findings suggest that states may want to encourage communication to occur at all levels. District-level meetings allow school-level administrators to communicate and collaborate about the K-3 Formative Assessment process with their peers. Then, school-level administrators connected with teachers. Teachers were also communicating and collaborating with one another. Finally, schools saw ways that they could share about the K-3 Formative Assessment to families.

States can examine how stakeholders are communicating with one another at different levels about the K-3 Formative Assessment in order to understand the best ways to facilitate communication and collaboration. For example, Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) seemed to be the most helpful means for teachers to discuss the K-3 Formative Assessment process. Resources given to administrators and support staff can detail the many ways that they can communicate while highlighting the pros and cons of each method. The findings also suggest that many of these communication and collaboration methods were capitalizing on pre-existing meetings and methods. When schools see that they can use already-established communication structures to discuss the K-3 Formative Assessment, they may be open to continuing to use the assessment.

Support and Resources

As states move forward implementing the K-3 Formative Assessment, they may want to learn more about what supports and resources have or have not been helpful to school-level stakeholders. We asked about supports that were provided to teachers as well as supports principals and support staff received from the state or district/county/region (Table 9). Then, we asked about what supports would be helpful to them as a principal or support staff (Table 10).

Support and resources received and provided

- **Eight principals and support staff stated that teachers sought support.** Teachers requested supports, such as different methods for data collection or observations, additional time to complete the assessment, technology supports, and substitutes to watch their class. Seven of the eight administrators were able to provide that support to teachers when requested.
- **Half received supports from the state.** Principals and support staff received training, resources (e.g., iPads), and communication (e.g., email check-ins). A third of respondents did not receive any supports from the state, and two respondents were not sure if they received supports.
- **Half received supports from the district/county/region.** Principals and support staff received training or resources (e.g., iPads or funding). Six respondents did not receive any resources, and one was not sure.

Supports and resources for principals

- **Administrator-specific supports and additional information about the K-3 Formative Assessment would be very helpful.** Twelve respondents said that having more information about the K-3 Formative Assessment that was tailored for principal would be very helpful. Eleven respondents stated that an administrator-specific training would be very helpful. Principals and support staff requested information, such as alignment with standards and how to support teachers to implement the assessment.
- **Respondents suggested other helpful supports.**
 - Receiving technology (e.g., iPads)
 - Attending the training with the teachers
 - Getting information about the assessment all at once instead of piece-by-piece
 - Having hands-on workshops or training
 - Providing materials to support developmental practices in classrooms
 - Creating a portal to share observations (e.g., Edmodo or Blackboard)
 - Talking or collaborating with other principals or school-level staff

Summary and Considerations: Although school-level stakeholders primarily found out about the K-3 Formative Assessment from district-level administrators, only half of principals and support staff reported receiving supports or resources from the state or district. Instead, teachers sought out support at the school-level. Principals and support staff reported that teachers reached out to them for support, and they were able to provide it. Therefore, states may want to consider how to equip school-level administrators with the necessary supports and resources since many teachers will likely reach out to a school-level administrator for support while administering the assessment. Lastly, survey results indicate that administrators appreciate administrator-specific supports and resources. Many of their suggestions can be incorporated into existing training and materials to prepare administrators to support teachers. In addition, finding opportunities to allow administrators a chance to share with one another may help them to support teachers as well, such as an online portal.

Attitudes and Opinions

Finally, we asked principals and support staff to share their attitudes and opinions about the K-3 Formative Assessment to understand how using the K-3 Formative Assessment influenced buy-in after the pilot process (Table 12). We asked about the benefits and challenges of the K-3 Formative Assessment as well as strategies that can be used to build support for the K-3 Formative Assessment. We also asked whether they thought the K-3 Formative Assessment would be helpful for driving instruction in classrooms.

- **Two-thirds of respondents recognized that the K-3 Formative Assessment benefits the child.** Of those that were able to identify benefits, four said that the assessment provided a whole child or developmentally appropriate view of the child, and four stated that the assessment offers a new way to gather information about a child. Three respondents said that there were no benefits, and one was not sure.

- **The amount of time the assessment takes is the biggest challenge to schools.** As noted, teachers’ biggest challenge in administering the assessment is the amount of time it takes to complete the assessment. Five principals and support staff reported that the amount of time to complete the assessment was also a challenge to schools overall. Others stated that the lack of resources and lack of alignment to other standards or assessments were also challenges to schools. Two respondents stated that the training did not fit their schools’ needs. Other challenges included lack of technology support, the assessment’s lack of fit with grades other than kindergarten, when in the year teachers started to use the assessment, and receiving parental permission for the child to go through the pilot process.
- **Respondents identified various strategies to help build support for the K-3 Formative Assessment.** The most popular way to build support was to provide resources, such as technology (e.g., iPads) or funding (e.g., paid training or release time) for the assessment process. Three respondents said that having ample and applicable training would help build support, but two respondents would not recommend trying to build support at all. Other strategies to build support included:
 - providing alignment with standards or other assessments;
 - having a slow roll-out of the assessment to schools;
 - establishing a learning community for teachers and administrators, involving principals more;
 - providing education about the importance of developmentally appropriate practices;
 - being up-front about the issues that teachers will face with data collection;
 - and having expert teachers help new teachers.
- **Half of the respondents felt that the K-3 Formative Assessment was a helpful resource to drive instruction in classrooms.** Seven of the 14 respondents saw the assessment as a helpful resource, but two felt that it was not a helpful resource to drive instruction, and five were not sure.

Summary and Considerations: Overall, principals and support staff recognize that the K-3 Formative Assessment can be beneficial, but they also struggle with the many challenges associated with the assessment process. Principals and support staff indicated that additional information and resources may help to reduce challenges. They were more likely to identify child-focused benefits of the assessment (e.g., developmentally appropriate practice) rather than how the assessment is helpful for guiding instruction. States may want to find ways to further educate school-level administrators on how the K-3 Formative Assessment not only helps to identify a child’s skill level, but can also help teachers individualize and tailor instructional practices for children at different skill levels to paint the assessment as a multi-faceted tool.

Additionally, states will want to examine how to prioritize addressing the various challenges that schools face when implementing the K-3 Formative Assessment. To address the issue of time, which is the most commonly stated challenge, states can provide professional development focused on strategies to efficiently and effectively collect data on children. Veteran teachers who have successfully used the K-3 Formative Assessment can help newer teachers by sharing their strategies for collecting data. States can

also offer technology training to show how to easily upload and use the technology platform as well as funding to pay for additional time teachers are using to collect and upload data to the technology platform or to pay for additional staff who can collect evidences or watch classes while the teacher collects and enters data. All of these options can help schools address the issue of time, but states must determine which is the best option for their state.

Final Recommendations

The results from the administrator and support staff survey conducted after the winter/spring pilot for the K-3 Formative Assessment offers a chance for the Research Partners and Consortium states to evaluate practices related to engaging principals and other support staff to support long-term implementation of the K-3 Formative Assessment. Our findings suggest that principals and support staff generally see the K-3 Formative Assessment in a positive light, but they would benefit from having more tailored education and training to help understand how they can support teachers when they face challenges with the K-3 Formative Assessment process. We have identified overall recommendations for future piloting, field testing, and full-scale implementation. It is important to note, however, that the recommendations are based on a small sample, and continued gathering of feedback will be necessary as the K-3 Formative Assessment is implemented over time and across states.

- **Encourage communication and collaboration with stakeholders at all levels:** From the state, to the district, to the school, to the public, successful implementation relies on the buy-in and engagement of stakeholders at all levels. Although half of those who participated in the survey were likely to receive resources and support from the state- or district-level, many reported learning about the K-3 Formative Assessment from district-level administrators. Principals and support staff seemed to communicate and collaborate during a variety of pre-existing district-level meetings or workshops. At the school-level, principals, support staff, and teachers were utilizing a variety of communication structures already in place in their school to communicate and collaborate about the using the K-3 Formative Assessment. For example, principals used one-on-one check-in times with teachers, and teachers used Professional Learning Community time to discuss the assessment. One principal also suggested that teachers who have previously used the assessment could provide support to new teachers on the assessment. Lastly, principals and support staff were also able to identify ways that they could be communicating with families about the K-3 Formative Assessment. Principals and support staff may communicate about the use of the assessment in the school, or teachers can share about individual children's skills during parent-teacher conferences.
- **Clearly and comprehensively explain the K-3 Formative Assessment process to stakeholders at all levels:** During the pilot process, teachers administering the assessment were the target population for professional development and training to use the K-3 Formative Assessment. The findings suggest that administrators at all levels would benefit from understanding detailed information about the assessment. State leads may want to continue to offer administrator-specific, in-person trainings since they were well-attended by the survey respondents. These

trainings can also be adapted for other stakeholders, such as superintendents, other state administrators, or families. In addition, state leads may want to find the most effective ways of communicating about online modules that provide similar information as presented in the in-person training. Capitalizing on methods that states already find to be successful in reaching out to various stakeholders will help to better disseminate relevant information. As the implementation process continues, state leads can plan for ways they will reach out to stakeholders at each level to solicit feedback about the K-3 Formative Assessment and to monitor their understanding of the formative assessment process.

- **Communicate frequently and with transparency about the K-3 Formative Assessment process:** In conjunction with involving and encouraging communication with stakeholders at each level, messaging about the K-3 Formative Assessment should acknowledge both the benefits as well as potential challenges that schools may face when using the assessment, especially at the beginning of the process. Knowing all the information at the start can help districts support schools, principals support teachers, and teachers support children and families. As states prioritize how they will address challenges, they can communicate frequently about what and how they plan to improve the assessment process. States will inevitably experience bumps in the road when rolling out a new assessment across a state, but being transparent about the issues and how they will or will not be addressed helps to build trust with those who may use the assessment.
- **Adapt messaging for specific audiences:** Districts and schools vary in their understanding of formative assessment, in their openness to new assessments, and in their current assessment practices. Thus, state leads will want to consider how they message and communicate about the K-3 Formative Assessment by meeting stakeholders where they are. For example, many survey respondents reported that they regularly use formative assessments in their school. State leads may want to learn more about whether these schools are interested in a new formative assessment or whether they are hesitant to learn a new assessment. Then, state leads can tailor their messaging about the K-3 Formative Assessment to fill any gaps. In other instances, some survey respondents were unable to identify the benefits of using the K-3 Formative Assessment. For this population, states may want to spend time detailing the benefits of formative assessment instead of the specific details of the assessment. Further, states may want to ground the K-3 Formative Assessment within a broader vision by explaining how the assessment serves a wide array of purposes—from identifying a child’s skill level to helping teachers to plan activities to integrating a whole child perspective in classrooms.
- **Consider a slower or tiered roll-out.** One survey respondent suggested that slowly rolling out the assessment across the state and within the schools may allow the implementation process to feel more manageable for schools. Slowly transitioning into the assessment process offers schools the time they need to familiarize themselves with assessment process in order to build the necessary support systems within their school over time. For instance, a principal may want

to start the assessment in a few classrooms so that the principal can identify potential challenges before all classrooms implement the assessment. By starting in a few classrooms, the principal can ensure that appropriate resources to support teachers in the next year exist. Also, veteran teachers with more experience can act as expert teachers for new teachers who start to administer the assessment, providing internal support for the assessment. Determining the best way to roll-out and scale-up the assessment may help to build buy-in across the state as well as to develop more stable support within schools and districts. States have multiple options when thinking about a slow roll-out: starting with schools who are already interested in the assessment; starting with teachers who have requested a formative assessment; identifying districts that have been successful implementing new assessments in the past, etc.

- **Facilitate a learning community.** Across stakeholders, a learning community offers them a chance to share with one another about successes and challenges. Survey respondents indicated that having a means to learn from other principals would be helpful. One respondent suggested using an online platform, such as Edmodo or Blackboard, to facilitate conversation. Principals can share strategies they have used to support teachers, pose questions about the assessment process, or share with one another about how they feel about the assessment process. Teachers may want learn about activities other teachers have used to collect data or formats they set up their room to facilitate data collection. An email listserv or a Pinterest page may work for teachers. Learning communities may function differently, but having a space for communication and collaboration can benefit those who want to learn from the experiences of others.
- **Build capacity to provide high-quality training and professional development.** Some challenges that school-level stakeholders face can be alleviated through improved training and professional development. Looking forward, states need to examine how they can build capacity to provide high-quality training and professional development for teachers who plan to use the K-3 Formative Assessment. Capacity-building activities include hiring, training, and monitoring the quality of trainers as well as technical assistance to teachers and school administrators who will, in turn, use the K-3 Formative Assessment. For example, principals and support staff suggested that having additional training on the technology (e.g., technology platform and app) would be helpful. Teachers can benefit from additional technology training so that technology is a facilitator than a deterrent for using the assessment. When principals or support staff are trained on the technology, they can offer targeted support for teachers.

Other indicated that spending time learning multiple strategies for collecting student data would be helpful for both teachers as well as principals and support staff. Teachers can have an arsenal of different data collection methods, where they can determine what would work best in their classroom. Principals can be equipped to provide alternative suggestions to teachers when they reach difficulties collecting data. Finally, principals and support staff suggested that having on-site training might be helpful. However, states will need to determine whether that is a reasonable and feasible undertaking. As implementation proceeds, state leads can evaluate the helpfulness and usefulness of the training and professional development to meet needs and

address challenges.

- **Provide tailored resources and materials:** While the pilot training and professional development focused heavily on preparing teachers to use the assessment, states may want to understand how they can also support other stakeholders by tailoring the resources and materials for others. Since principals have a uniquely different role, states should consider the ways that they can adapt and tailor resources, trainings, and materials to support principals in their specific role of supporting teachers. Many principals and support staff suggested that having administrator-specific resources would help. For instance, many teachers sought help from principals instead of individuals at the district- or state-level, so equipping school-level administrators with the necessary resources to support teachers builds in-house support structures. Other topics that may be particularly useful to administrators include:
 - **Benefits of formative assessment.** Because principals are monitoring the use of multiple assessments across the early grades and balancing the mandates of a variety of assessments, it is important to explain clearly the purpose and benefit of using formative assessments in classrooms. States may want to consider how they can educate principals on the appropriate use of formative assessment in classrooms and the appropriate use of formative assessments results in teacher evaluations (if at all). States may also want to determine a way to communicate the benefits of teachers using formative assessments in their classroom, especially in areas where a formative assessment is not mandated by the state or district. Lastly, states will want to provide principals with information about how the assessment aligns to other assessments their teachers must complete or with other standards that teachers must meet so that principals understand how the assessment fits into what teachers are already completing.
 - **How to support teachers to administer the assessment.** Principals primarily provide support to teachers when using the K-3 Formative Assessment. Because teachers are relying on principals to provide them with these techniques, states may want to consider providing principals with a list of strategies or methods that they can use to recommend to their teacher. In trainings, states can show videos of how the formative assessment has been integrated successfully into a classroom, or they can offer hands-on examples. When thinking about the resources that principals may provide to teachers (e.g., substitutes, paid time, technology devices, etc.), states may want to walk principals through which state- or district-level processes they would need to follow to provide teachers with these resources.
 - **How to support teachers to use the data from the assessment.** Because the K-3 Formative Assessment is a rich source of information on children, principals and support staff will want to understand how they can guide teachers to use the information gathered from the assessment. For instance, principals can use time during a grade-level meeting in order to discuss how the results of the K-3 Formative Assessment can identify children who may need special services. In addition, principals and support staff can help teachers strategize about how they may want to communicate with families

about where their child lands on a progression to encourage developmentally appropriate activities in the home to support learning.

- **Find ways to reduce the burden of using the assessment, when possible:** Time was consistently reported as the biggest challenge to teachers when administering the assessment, which could be challenging to schools overall. Although offering additional funding or staff may not be reasonable or feasible, whenever possible, states should consider the different ways that they can reduce the burden that the K-3 Formative Assessment may pose for stakeholders. Principals and support staff proposed paying for the additional time that teachers use to collect or enter data into the technology platform. Others suggested having additional staff either collect data or watch classrooms while teachers are collecting data in order to make data collection more amenable to teachers. States must determine which is the best option for their state. State leads may also find that there may need to be necessary burdens in order to pursue a formative assessment process in schools.
- **Determine who will drive the implementation process:** Ensuring a successful roll-out of the K-3 Formative Assessment requires balancing multiple moving pieces within a state. Accordingly, the lead agency may want to spend time designating who will be responsible for driving the implementation process. Establishing a leadership structure clarifies who is responsible for which portions of the implementation process and facilitates decision-making around the K-3 Formative Assessment. Specific individuals may be responsible for separate tasks. For instance, one individual may be in charge of making sure that all district- and school-level administrators have received comprehensive information about the K-3 Formative Assessment in districts and schools where teachers are using the assessment. That individual can liaise between the state and stakeholders on the ground to ensure that information is being shared effectively. In another example, a core team of state-level administrators may be tapped with deciding how the state may fund any technology device that districts may want to provide to teachers in order to collect student information. Once the state designates the roles and responsibilities, they will want to document the expectations clearly in writing (e.g., in a Terms of Reference or implementation plan).

Appendix 1: Data tables

Table 1. Respondent characteristics

Characteristic	Percentage
<i>State (n=14)</i>	
Arizona	50%
Iowa	21%
Rhode Island	29%
<i>Role (n=14)</i>	
Principal	64%
Interventionist, Specialist, or Coach	29%
Superintendent	7%
<i>Involvement in the pilot (n=14)*</i>	
Minimal (i.e., is not familiar with the assessment but receives updates and provides support as needed)	50%
Moderate (i.e., is familiar with the assessment, discusses the process with teachers)	29%
Heavy (i.e., is familiar with the assessment, actively participates in the pilot process through data collection or observations)	21%

*Note: Respondents were able to provide multiple responses; therefore percentages will not add to 100%. Percentages represent the percent of respondents that mentioned a particular response.

Table 2. Decision-making about the K-3 Formative Assessment pilot

Were you the one who determined whether the K-3 Formative Assessment would be piloted in your school? (n=14)

Yes	50%
No	43%
Not sure	7%

*What led to the decision to give teachers the opportunity to participate in the pilot? (n=7)**

Interest in a developmentally appropriate tool	43%
Ability to have a voice and provide feedback on a tool for the state	29%
Interest in cutting-edge or not previously used tools	43%

Did you have reservations about the assessment? If yes, what were they? (n=14)

Yes (n=5)*	36%
Time	80%
Fit with curriculum or current teaching methods	40%
Lack of technology support	20%
No	57%

*What additional information would have been helpful to have when you first learned about the K-3 Formative Assessment? (n=10)**

The amount of time it will take	30%
I didn't need additional information	20%
Alignment to other assessments	10%
How to use the technology	10%
Strategies to streamline the data collection process	10%
Complete details on the domains from the start	10%

*Who told you about the assessment? (n=13)**

State-level administrator	23%
District-, county-, or regional-level administrator	38%
Principal or other school-level administrator	8%
A teacher	38%
Workshop	8%

*Who told teachers about the assessment? (n=14)**

State-level administrator	7%
District-, county-, or regional-level administrator	43%
Principal or other school-level administrator	29%
A teacher	21%

*Note: Respondents were able to provide multiple responses; therefore percentages will not add to 100%. Percentages represent the percent of respondents that mentioned a particular response.

Table 3. Perception of the K-3 Formative Assessment

<i>What was your initial perception of the assessment? (n=14)</i>	
Positive	57%
Neutral	43%
Negative	0%
<i>How did your perception change? (n=14)</i>	
More positive	43%
Stayed the same	21%
Less positive	36%
<i>What were teachers' initial perception of the assessment? (n=14)</i>	
Positive	50%
Neutral	43%
Negative	7%
<i>How did their perception change? (n=14)</i>	
More positive	36%
Stayed the same	21%
Less positive	43%

Table 4. Training

<i>Did you attend an in-person training? (n=14)</i>	
Yes	50%
Summer/Fall administrator training	43%
Winter/Spring administrator training	57%
Summer/Fall teacher training	0%
No	50%
<i>Did you complete the online training modules? (n=14)</i>	
Yes	14%
No	71%
I didn't have time.	20%
I didn't know about them.	80%
Not sure	14%

Table 5. Assessment practices

<i>Current use of formative assessments in your early primary grades (K-3)</i> (n=14)*	
Used frequently	43%
To guide and individualize instruction	21%
For the pilot process only	21%
To create planning cycles	7%
<i>Challenges (n=12)*</i>	
Time	75%
Issues with technology (e.g., user-friendliness)	25%
Getting parent permission	17%
Training	8%
Rubrics were unclear	8%
<i>Ways to use data (n=12)*</i>	
To guide and individualize instruction	58%
To identify intervention or services	17%
To identify child's skills	17%
To group students	8%
Not sure	17%

*Note: Respondents were able to provide multiple responses; therefore percentages will not add to 100%. Percentages represent the percent of respondents that mentioned a particular response.

Table 6. Communication and collaboration

<i>Did you communicate or collaborate with others at the district-level about the K-3 Formative Assessment?</i> (n=14)	
Yes*	92%
Meetings	71%
Presentation	14%
Informal (e.g., email and conversations)	14%
No	8%
<i>Do you feel it is beneficial for teachers across the early primary grades (K-3) to collaborate or communicate about the assessment?</i> (n=14)	
Yes	86%
No	14%
<i>What would you communicate to families about the K-3 Formative Assessment if you continue to use it in your school?</i> (n=10)*	
The assessment looks at the whole child on a continuum of skills.	40%
Strategies parents can use to help with child's skills	40%
I'm not sure what I would share	30%
I wouldn't share anything with families	10%

*Note: Respondents were able to provide multiple responses; therefore percentages will not add to 100%. Percentages represent the percent of respondents that mentioned a particular response.

Table 7. Methods to check in with teachers

<i>Did you use this method to check-in with teachers?</i>	<i>If yes, how often did you check-in using this method over the data collection period?</i>				
	Yes	Once or twice	Monthly	Weekly	Daily
Email (n=13)	69%	33%	33%	22%	11%
Phone (n=12)	8%	0%	100%	0%	0%
Meetings (n=14)	79%	18%	64%	18%	0%
One-on-one conversations (n=14)	100%	31%	31%	23%	15%

Table 8. Venues for teacher communication and collaboration

<i>Have teachers used this venue to communicate and collaborate?</i>	<i>Was this venue very helpful, somewhat helpful, or not helpful?</i>			<i>Was this in place before the pilot started?</i>		
	Yes	Very	Somewhat	Not	Yes	No
Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) (n=14)	57%	100%	0%	0%	63%	38%
Grade-level meetings (e.g., K meeting) (n=14)	79%	73%	27%	0%	100%	0%
Teacher-principal meetings (n=14)	71%	50%	50%	0%	100%	0%
Informal discussions with other teachers (n=14)	93%	62%	38%	0%	92%	8%

Table 9. Support and resources

<i>Specific supports requested by teachers for the K-3 Formative Assessment (n=14)</i>	
Yes (n=8)*	57%
Methods for data collection/observation	38%
Time	38%
Technology	25%
Additional staff (e.g., substitutes)	13%
No	43%
<i>Were you or someone else able to provide that support? (n=8)</i>	
Yes	87.5%
<i>State supports for the K-3 Formative Assessment (n=12)*</i>	
Trainings or meetings	33%
Resources (e.g., iPads)	17%
Communication (e.g., emails)	8%
No resources	33%
Not sure	17%
<i>District/county/region supports for the K-3 Formative Assessment (n=14)*</i>	
Trainings or meetings	29%
Resources (e.g., iPads or funding)	29%
No resources	43%
Not sure	7%
<i>Most helpful resource or support (n=9)*</i>	
Time or meetings to work with teachers	44%
Information about the assessment	22%
Communication or collaboration with others about the process	22%
Technology support or access	22%
*Note: Respondents were able to provide multiple responses; therefore percentages will not add to 100%. Percentages represent the percent of respondents that mentioned a particular response.	

Table 10. Administrator supports and resources

	Very helpful	Somewhat helpful	Not helpful	Not sure
Being able to talk or collaborate with other principals/building-level support staff	64%	21%	0%	14%
Having an administrator-specific training (in-person or online)	79%	14%	0%	7%
Having more information about the K-3 Formative Assessment, tailored for principals	85%	7%	0%	7%
Having more information about how to support K-3 teachers to implement the assessment	71%	29%	0%	0%
Having information about the alignment of the K-3 Formative Assessment with the Early Learning Guidelines or Standards/Common Core	79%	14%	7%	0%

Table 11. Attitudes and opinions

<i>Benefits of the K-3 Formative Assessment pilot (n=12)*</i>	
Provides a whole child or developmentally appropriate view of the child	33%
Offers a new way to gather information on a child	33%
No benefits	25%
Not sure	8%
<i>Challenges of the K-3 Formative Assessment pilot (n=12)*</i>	
Amount of time to do the assessment	42%
Resources (e.g., funding or materials)	25%
Alignment with other standards or assessments	25%
Training didn't fit needs	17%
Lack of technology support	8%
Fit for other grades	8%
Start time of the assessment (halfway through the year)	8%
Getting parent permission for child participation	8%
<i>Strategies to build support for the K-3 Formative Assessment (n=13)*</i>	
Provide resources (e.g., technology, materials, funding)	31%
Ample and applicable training	23%
Alignment with standards or other assessments	15%
Slow roll-out of the assessment	15%
Learning community	15%
Involvement of principals	8%
Education about the importance of developmentally appropriate practices	8%
Clarity about issues faced doing the data collection	8%
Having expert teachers help new teachers	8%
Would not recommend	15%
<i>Overall, do you think this K-3 Formative Assessment has been or could be a helpful resource for driving instruction in classrooms? (n=14)</i>	
Yes	50%
No	14%
Not sure	36%

*Note: Respondents were able to provide multiple responses; therefore percentages will not add to 100%. Percentages represent the percent of respondents that mentioned a particular response.

Appendix 2: K3 Consortium Supervisory Survey

Introduction

2) Select your state.

- Arizona
- Iowa
- Maine
- Rhode Island

3) What is your role or position at the school?

4) Were you the one who determined whether the K-3 Formative Assessment would be piloted in your school?

- Yes
- No
- Not sure

5) What led to the decision to give teachers in your school the opportunity to participate in this pilot?

6) Can you describe how, if at all, you've been involved with the K-3 Formative Assessment pilot in your school?

Initial thoughts about the K-3 Formative Assessment

7) How did you hear about the K-3 Formative Assessment? (check all that apply)

- State-level administrator
- Administrator at the district-, county-, or regional-level
- Another principal or school-level administrator
- A teacher
- Other - Write In (Required): _____*

8) What was your initial perception of the K-3 Formative Assessment when you first learned your school would have the opportunity to implement the new K-3 Formative Assessment?

- Positive
- Negative
- Neutral

9) How has that perception changed since the pilot process began?

- More positive perception now
- Less positive perception now
- My perception has not changed

10) Did you have any reservations about participating in the pilot?

- Yes
- No
- Not sure

11) What were your reservations?

12) How did the pilot teachers in your school initially hear about the K-3 Formative Assessment? (check all that apply)

State-level administrator

Administrator at the district, county, or regional level

Another principal or school-level administrator

Another teacher

Other - Write In (Required): _____ *

13) What were teachers' initial perceptions of the K-3 Formative Assessment when they first learned their school would have the opportunity to implement the new K-3 Formative Assessment?

Positive

Negative

Neutral

14) How has their perception changed since the pilot process began?

More positive perception now

Less positive perception now

Their perception has not changed

15) What additional information would have been helpful to have when you first learned about the K-3 Formative Assessment? In other words, did you face any challenges or difficulties that could have been alleviated with more information at the beginning of the pilot process?

Training

16) Did you attend an in-person training?

Yes

No

Not sure

17) Which training did you attend? (check all that apply)

Summer/Fall administrator training

Winter/Spring administrator training

Fall teacher training

Not sure

18) What aspects were helpful or not helpful?

19) Did you complete an online administrator training module by SRI International?

Yes

No

Not sure

20) Please indicate which online administrator training modules provided by SRI International you completed (if any).

	Did you complete this module?			If yes, how helpful was this module?		
	Yes	No	Not sure	Very helpful	Somewhat helpful	Not helpful
1: What does this assessment look like?	()	()	()	()	()	()
2: Purpose and background of the project	()	()	()	()	()	()
3: Data security and the IRB	()	()	()	()	()	()
4: Supporting your pilot teachers	()	()	()	()	()	()

21) Why did you not complete the online administrator training modules? (select the response that best represents your view)

I didn't have time.

I didn't know about them.

I didn't think I needed the information

Other - Write In: _____

22) If teachers discussed the training with you, what did they find helpful or not helpful?

Current assessment practices

23) How are formative assessments currently being used in your early primary grades (K-3)?

24) What benefits or barriers do you experience in your school using formative assessments?

Communication

25) Did you communicate or collaborate with others at the district-level about the K-3 Formative Assessment?

Yes

No

Not sure

26) How did you communicate or collaborate with them?

27) Below is a list of venues that may have been used by your teachers to communicate or collaborate about the K-3 Formative Assessment. Please indicate if they have used this venue and whether it was very helpful, somewhat helpful, or not helpful to them. We also want to know whether this venue was in place before the K-3 Formative Assessment was piloted in your school.

	Have teachers used this venue to communicate and collaborate?			If yes, was this venue very helpful, somewhat helpful, or not helpful?			If yes, was this in place before the K-3 Formative Assessment started in your school?		
	Yes	No	Not sure	Very helpful	Somewhat helpful	Not helpful	Yes	No	Not sure
Professional Learning Communities (PLCs)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Grade-level meetings (e.g., K meeting)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Teacher-principal meetings	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Informal discussions with other teachers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

28) Are there other venues that we haven't talked about that your teachers use for collaboration and communication?

- Yes
- No
- Not sure

29) What are they?

30) Do you feel it is beneficial for teachers across the early primary grades (K-3) to collaborate or communicate about the assessment?

- Yes
- No
- Not sure

Assessment Process

31) Although this was not an expectation of the pilot, we want to know in what ways, if any, you checked in with your teachers about how the data collection process for the K-3 Formative Assessment was going? (check all that apply)

	Did you use this method to check-in with teachers?		If yes, how often did you check-in using this method over the data collection period?			
	Yes	No	Once or twice	Monthly	Weekly	Daily
Email	()	()	()	()	()	()
Phone	()	()	()	()	()	()
Meetings	()	()	()	()	()	()
One-on-one conversations	()	()	()	()	()	()

32) What, if any, challenges did teachers in your school face in their effort to accomplish data collection?

33) What would you communicate to families about the K-3 Formative Assessment if you continue to use it in your school?

34) How could you envision teachers using data generated from the K-3 Formative Assessment in your school? For this question, when we say “data,” we mean the information or evidence that is generated from the assessment about children, not the information collected by the teacher to inform the assessment.

35) Overall, do you think this K-3 Formative Assessment has been or could be a helpful resource for driving instruction in classrooms?

- () Yes
- () No
- () Not sure

36) Why?

37) Why not?

Ongoing support

38) Did your teachers ask you for any specific type of support in order to conduct the K-3 Formative Assessment?

- () Yes
- () No
- () Not sure

39) What types of support were requested?

40) Were you or someone else able to provide that support?

- Yes
- No
- Not sure

41) How, if at all, did the state support the implementation of the K-3 Formative Assessment in your school? What resources or support did your school receive? Were they helpful? Why or why not?

42) How, if at all, did the district/county/region support the implementation of the K-3 Formative Assessment in your school? What resources or support did your school receive? Were they helpful? Why or why not?

43) For the following supports or resources, which ones would be helpful to you as an administrator or for other principals for the future use of the K-3 Formative Assessment?

	Very helpful	Somewhat helpful	Not helpful	Not sure
Being able to talk or collaborate with other principals/building-level support staff	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Having an administrator-specific training (in-person or online)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Having more information about the K-3 Formative Assessment, tailored for principals	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Having more information about how to support K-3 teachers to implement the assessment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Having information about the alignment of the K-3 Formative Assessment with the Early Learning Guidelines or Standards/Common Core	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

44) What other supports or resources, if any, would be helpful to you as an administrator?

45) Of ALL the resources and supports you just mentioned or you have used during this process, which was the most helpful?

Attitudes and Opinions

46) What benefits, if any, have you seen as a result of the piloting of the K-3 Formative Assessment in your school this year? Has it helped your school in ways that you did not expect? Please provide examples.

47) What challenges, if any, have you seen as a result of the piloting of the K-3 Formative Assessment in your school this year? Please provide examples.

48) If your state wanted to encourage other schools and teachers to implement the K-3 Formative Assessment, what are some strategies or ways that they could get them on board or buy into using the assessment? Specify which strategies work best for engaging teachers and which strategies work best for engaging principals or other support staff.

49) Please share any other topics, suggestions, or comments you have about implementing the K-3 Formative Assessment that you think would be helpful for us to know.